



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2024

by J Downs BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/23/3332158

16A Stoneleigh Road, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0JB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Sabine Zia against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 1464/23.
 - The development proposed is Erection of a new three bedroomed, three storey dwelling attached to the existing house with amenity space and parking for one car.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. There is a minor inconsistency in the plans before me in that the front projection is shown as having a gable on the proposed side elevation and a hipped roof on the proposed front elevation. This point was not determinative therefore there is no prejudice from my proceeding to determine the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a narrow plot sat between 16 and 18 Stoneleigh Road. It historically appears to have been part of the plot associated with No16, which is an end terrace property. The properties on this side of the road sit notably above the level of the road, while those on the opposite side sit lower. The majority of the surrounding dwellings are two storey however there is a range of forms and appearances. A number have also been extended, resulting in a varied streetscape.
5. The proposed dwelling would be noticeably more narrow than the surrounding dwellings due to the limited width of the plot. This narrow appearance would be reinforced by the lack of width in the gable projection, highlighting the constrained nature of the plot. This would be exacerbated by views along the street to the clearly wider projection that forms the other end of the terrace.
6. The proposed windows at first floor would be very similar in width to those of No16. However, they would appear much larger due to their increased height and increased proportion of the elevation that would appear glazed due to the limited width of the proposed dwelling. While there is not a consistent pattern

or style of fenestration in the area, windows are proportionate to the scale of the elevations and do not dominate as they do on the proposed dwelling.

7. A number of the gaps between terraces have been developed. However, these typically have been side extensions to the existing dwellings and are read as such. They have a different appearance to a new dwelling in that they do not add features such as front doors. These extensions serve to reinforce the more generous proportions of the existing properties when compared to the limited width of the proposed dwelling. Consequently, the proposed dwelling would appear as a cramped and incongruous addition to the street scene.
8. Extensions and alterations to the rear of properties, including to the roof, both along Stoneleigh Road and to the rear were visible at my site visit. Many of these are substantial and include the properties to either side of the appeal site. As a result, the extensions to the rear of the proposed dwelling would not appear unduly cramped, intrusive or overbearing.
9. No16 has a traditional pitched roof and gable end. The proposed dwelling would replicate this, albeit with a front projection immediately adjacent to No18. This would contrast with the roof form of No18, which is a bespoke combination of parapet, hipped and flat-roofed. However, a variety of roof forms was readily apparent along Stoneleigh Road. This included contrasting styles in proximity to each other such as the relationship between Nos 18 and 20. As a result, the contrast that would arise from the proposal would not appear as particularly incongruous or harmful to the street scene.
10. The proposed development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Redbridge Local Plan (2018) Policy LP26 and London Plan 2021 Policy D4 which, taken together and insofar as they relate to this appeal, require development to be well integrated and respect the existing layout of buildings, open spaces and patterns of development. It would also be contrary to the advice in section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires development to be well-designed.

Other Matters

11. The proposed development, in isolation of the concerns I have identified above, would be capable of delivering a dwelling within an existing urban area with good access to services and facilities.
12. There is no suggestion that the proposed dwelling would not provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers and I have no reason to disagree. However this would be expected of any well designed development and as such is neutral.
13. The appellant has directed me to a number of other decisions of the Council. This appeal must be determined on its own planning merits but I acknowledge there should be consistency in how the planning system operates. However not all of the examples given are for new dwellings which, as I have highlighted above, have a different visual effect to extensions. Furthermore, Stoneleigh Road is particularly distinctive given the changes in ground levels and varying forms of development along its length. This means that the exact circumstances in which this proposal is being considered would not be replicated elsewhere.

14. I have determined this appeal on the basis of the evidence before me. The manner in which the Council behaved in the determination of the application is not within the remit of this appeal.
15. The appeal site is within 6.2km of the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which is subject to, among other things, pressures from recreational disturbance. Had I been minded to allow the appeal, it would have been necessary to establish whether the proposal on its own or in combination with other projects would likely have significant environmental effects on the integrity of the SAC. However, it has not been necessary for me to pursue this issue as a finding that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC, with or without any mitigation, would be at best a neutral matter.

Planning Balance

16. The Council has indicated that it has not achieved the requisite level of housing delivery as measured in the Housing Delivery Test. By virtue of Footnote 8 of the Framework, paragraph 11d) of the Framework applies.
17. There would be a benefit from the delivery of an additional dwelling within an urban area with ready access to services and facilities. There would also be the associated economic benefits arising from the construction and occupation stages of the development. As the proposal is for a single dwelling, I attach limited weight to these benefits.
18. However, the Framework is unequivocal that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Development should add to the overall quality of the area. I attach significant weight to the harm the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the area.
19. Even if I were to be satisfied that paragraph 11d)i did apply, the proposal would not benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development as the adverse impacts of allowing the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Conclusion

20. The appeal proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight, including the policies of the Framework, to suggest the decision should be made otherwise. Therefore, for the reasons given, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Downs

INSPECTOR